

**A667 Ringley Road, Bury
Proposed S278 Highway Works
Stage 1&2 Road Safety Audit**

Prepared by



Distribution List

1. Conor Tulip – Paddock Johnson
2. File Copy

REPORT NUMBER 2025/PJ/2446

CONTACT

Naresh Madhavan
Highway Associates
International House
Aviation Park
Flint Road
Chester
CH4 0GZ

Tel: 07715109788

Email: Naresh@HighwayAssociates.co.uk
Web: www.HighwayAssociates.co.uk

Issue and revision record

Revision	Date	Originator	Checker	Approver	Description
FINAL	05/08/25	N Madhavan	R Sawczyn	NS Madhavan	For Issue

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	ITEMS RAISED BY PREVIOUS AUDITS AND REPORTS.....	3
3	ITEMS RAISED BY THIS AUDIT	4
4	AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT.....	7

Appendix A: Drawings and documents provided

Appendix B: Plans of items raised by this audit

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This report results from a Stage 1&2 Road Safety Audit carried out relating to S278 proposals in the way of a new priority junction off A667 Ringley Road, Bury associated with a new residential development. The audit was carried out during August 2025.

1.2 The audit team consisted of:

Team Leader: Naresh Madhavan MCIHT, MSoRSA EU RSA Cert. Comp
Director
Highway Associates

Team Member: Robin Sawczyn BEng MCIHT MSoRSA
Senior Road Safety Engineer
Highway Associates

1.3 The audit took place at the offices of Highway Associates, Chester. The Road Safety Audit was undertaken in accordance with the Road Safety Audit Brief provided by Conor Tulip of Paddock Johnson. The Road Safety Audit comprised an examination of the documents provided, and these are listed in Appendix A.

The site was visited by the audit team at the following times/conditions:

Day/Date	Time	Weather Con	Traffic Flow
Fri 1 st August 2025	14:00 – 14:40hrs	Dry/Cloudy	Ave

1.4 The terms of reference for this audit are as given in GG119, Design Manual for Roads and Bridges. The scheme has been examined and this report compiled only with regard to the safety implications for road users of the scheme as presented. It has not been examined or verified for compliance with any other standards or criteria. However, in order to clearly explain a safety problem or the recommendation to resolve a problem, the Audit Team may on occasion have referred to a design standard for information only. Any audit comments should not be construed as implying that a technical audit has been undertaken in any respect.

1.5 If relevant within this report the generic term “pedestrians” can include walking pedestrians, wheelchair users, dismounted cyclists, the blind, partially sighted, mobility impaired and people

with prams or pushchairs. Highway Maintenance Operatives are also included within this term. Where a problem is specific to one or more of these vulnerable groups then appropriate reference will be made in the report.

- 1.6 Any recommendations included within this report should not be regarded as being prescriptive design solutions to the problems identified. They are intended only to indicate a proportionate and viable means of eliminating or mitigating the identified problem, in accordance with GG119, and in no way imply that a formal design process has been undertaken. There may be alternative methods of addressing a problem which would be equally acceptable in achieving the desired elimination or mitigation and these should be considered when responding to this report.
- 1.7 This Road Safety Audit makes allowance for the fact that strategic decisions on matters such as route choice, junction type, standard of provision and approved Departures from Standards already reflect an appropriate balance of a number of factors including road safety.
- 1.8 The Audit Team have not been made aware of any possible geometric departures or relaxations from standards.
- 1.9 The reader is reminded that a Road Safety Audit is not limited to the new works alone where there are features that are considered by the Audit Team to affect the general safety in the area. Section 3 of this report lists 'Problems' identified from the drawings and as a result of the site visit relating to the proposed changes to the highway layout that are directly, or indirectly, related to the area (e.g. features/matters within the proposed works or immediate surrounds which the Audit Team feel should be brought to the attention of the Designer or other organisations even though they might not pose an immediate risk associated with the proposed works), and which are considered by the Audit Team to warrant attention under the subject proposals, generally by the maintaining authority. On occasions there are more sensitive issues or issues that fall outside the audit brief but which are of such a nature that Auditors feel should be specifically brought to the attention of the authorities - such issues, if they arise, are usually dealt with in detail in separate correspondence.

2 ITEMS RAISED BY PREVIOUS AUDITS AND REPORTS

- 2.1 It is understood no previous road safety audits have been undertaken in relation to this element of the scheme.

3 ITEMS RAISED BY THIS AUDIT

3.1 General

3.1.1 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Ringley Road – Proposed junction

SUMMARY: Insufficient right turn provision could lead to rear end shunts

Dedicated right turn provision has not been proposed to enable northbound vehicles to turn right into the development site. Insufficient right turn provision could result in an increased potential for rear end shunts as vehicles waiting to turn right are struck by following vehicles.

RECOMMENDATION

Carry out further assessment and analysis to determine the appropriate level of right turn provision required.

3.1.2 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Proposed junction

SUMMARY: Reduced visibility

It is noted that the proposed junction is located in an area where there is substantial boundary hedging and foliage. Concern is expressed that foliage could reduce visibility for drivers who are attempting to turn out of the junction increasing the potential for failure to give way type conflicts such as side-on or rear end shunts.

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure suitable visibility splays are provided which should be kept clear and maintained of all high-level boundary treatment.

3.2 Non-Motorised Road User Provision

3.2.1 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Proposed junction – Uncontrolled crossing

SUMMARY: Excessive crossing width could increase the potential for pedestrian to vehicular conflict

The proposed uncontrolled inline pedestrian crossing facility across the proposed junction bellmouth measures over 24 metres wide. This is deemed to be excessive and may increase the likelihood of pedestrians, particularly those who are less mobile, becoming stranded midway within the crossing should a vehicle attempt to turn in or out, increasing the potential for pedestrian to vehicular conflict within the bellmouth. Furthermore, having a single stage crossing

of this width could cause difficulties for visually impaired pedestrians who may due to the significant distance be inclined to travel towards a full height kerb or indeed towards the mainline carriageway risking conflicts with passing traffic.

RECOMMENDATION

A suitable splitter island should be installed within the junction bellmouth paying particular attention to swept path analysis.

3.2.2 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Proposed junction - Uncontrolled crossing

SUMMARY: Reduced visibility

Notwithstanding problem 3.1.2, it is noted that the proposed junction is located in an area where there is substantial boundary hedging and foliage. Concern is expressed that foliage within the vicinity of the junction could reduce visibility for pedestrians who are attempting to cross the junction and for drivers travelling towards the junction from within the site increasing the potential for pedestrian to vehicular conflicts on the crossing.

RECOMMENDATION

Ensure suitable visibility splays are provided at the crossing which should be kept clear and maintained of all high level boundary treatment.

3.3 **Road Signs and Markings**

3.3.1 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Proposed junction

SUMMARY: Road markings could cause confusion

The proposed giveway road markings have been set back in line with the back of footway similar to a “Copenhagen” style junction arrangement. Concern is expressed that this could exacerbate issues mentioned within Problem 3.1.2 and 3.2.2 but also, if used in isolation cause confusion to drivers as to the appropriate place to giveway giving rise to failure to giveway type conflicts.

RECOMMENDATION

The giveway road markings should be repositioned in line with the mainline channel line.

3.4 **Lighting and Signals**

No comments at this stage

3.5 **Landscaping**

No comments at this stage

3.6 **Protective Aids**

No comments at this stage

3.7 **Surface Characteristics and Drainage**

3.7.1 PROBLEM

LOCATION: Ringley Road – Proposed junction

SUMMARY: Drainage gully location could cause loss of control

An existing drainage gully appears to be located within the proposed junction. Due to the inherent lack of skid resistance afforded by cast iron gulleys particularly when wet, concern is expressed that should it be struck particularly by powered or unpowered two wheelers whilst turning, that it could increase the risk of loss of control.

RECOMMENDATION

The gully should be relocated to a suitable position along the kerb line.

4 AUDIT TEAM STATEMENT

We certify that this Audit has been carried out in accordance with the guidelines in GG119.

AUDIT TEAM LEADER

Naresh Madhavan MCIHT MSoRSA EU RSA Cert. Comp
Director
Highway Associates
International House
Aviation Park
Flint Road
Chester
CH4 0GZ

Signed:



Date:

05/08/25

AUDIT TEAM MEMBER

Robin Sawczyn BEng MCIHT MSoRSA
Senior Road Safety Engineer
Highway Associates
International House
Aviation Park
Flint Road
Chester
CH4 0GZ

Signed:



Date:

05/08/25

APPENDIX A

DRAWINGS AND DOCUMENTS PROVIDED

-  SGC-AJP-XX-00-DR-C-1440-P01 SITE B - S278 AGREEMENT PLAN
-  SGC-AJP-XX-00-DR-C-1450-P01 SITE B - S278 SURFACING & KERBING PLAN
-  SGC-AJP-XX-00-DR-C-1460-P01 SITE B - S278 SITE CLEARANCE LAYOUT
-  SGC-AJP-XX-00-DR-C-1470-P01 SITE B - S38-S278 HIGHWAY DETAILS
-  SGC-AJP-XX-00-DR-C-1480-P01 SITE B - S278 Vehicle Tracking

APPENDIX B

PLAN OF ITEMS RAISED BY THIS AUDIT

